



# 2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey: Executive Summary for Government-Owned/Leased Family Housing (GOL-FH)

Prepared for Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC)



Prepared by Robert D. Niehaus, Inc. (RDN)  
6 June 2025



## Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Overview.....	1
2. Survey Distribution and Execution .....	1
3. Scoring Methodology .....	2
4. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey .....	3
5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question .....	6
6. Comment Analysis.....	6
7. Discussion.....	7
8. Awards.....	9
9. Action Plans.....	10
10. Summary.....	10
11. Appendix: Survey Changes and Question Mapping .....	11

## Tables

Table 1. Rating Scale Levels .....	2
Table 2. Score Index Range Interpretation .....	3
Table 3. GOL-FH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey .....	4
Table 4. GOL-FH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey .....	5
Table 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question .....	6
Table 6. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation .....	7
Table 7. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation .....	7
Table 8. GOL-FH Properties: A List Platinum or A List Award Winners.....	9
Table 9. GOL-FH Installations: Action Plan Required.....	10
Table 10. Legend for 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map.....	11
Table 11. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map.....	11



## 1. Overview

The 2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey (TSS) for Government-Owned/Leased (GOL) Family Housing (FH) was launched on 3 March 2025 and closed on 1 May 2025. All US Navy FH tenants were eligible to take the survey (limited to one response per household). While participation was expressly voluntary, all residents were encouraged to participate. A total of 2,016 responses were received from 13 installations, representing approximately 34.8 percent of the 5,800 surveys distributed.

Robert D. Niehaus, Inc. (RDN) was contracted to administer the survey and analyze the results on behalf of Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC). The following report provides an executive summary of the survey results for key metrics, including scores by “Satisfaction Index” and “Business Success Factor,” comparisons to the previous survey (2023), the highest/lowest scores for individual questions, and common themes expressed in respondents’ free-form comments.

## 2. Survey Distribution and Execution

CNIC provided RDN with a current snapshot of Navy FH inventory and resident information in mid-February 2025. This data included the address and contact information for each household. RDN cleaned and reconciled these data to match the set of Properties/Neighborhoods, Installations, and Regions used in prior surveys or as otherwise directed by CNIC. These data were then used as the basis for distributing surveys and calculating response rates and scores for each reporting level.

All eligible FH tenants (including civilians) with email addresses on file were sent personalized invitations to participate in the survey. Additionally, RDN crafted promotional posters, flyers, and videos for distribution and created a universal survey link for CNIC, Regional, and Installation-level housing management staff to share with residents who did not receive a personalized email invitation. Residents did not receive a survey invitation via email in cases where (1) the resident did not have an email on file or (2) the email provided “bounced,” i.e., the email address was invalid/inactive or the message was otherwise rejected by the tenant’s email server. The official count of “distributed surveys” includes only households that received a personalized survey invitation or otherwise submitted a provisional survey through the general survey website and were later verified as residents by CNIC.

RDN developed and hosted a dedicated web environment for the survey, featuring additional information pages, messages from command, and access to the general survey link. These materials and resources were utilized to promote and distribute links to the survey through both physical and digital CNIC channels, ensuring that residents without a personal or work email on file could participate as well.

RDN sent weekly reminders by email to any residents who had not yet completed the survey. Each electronic invitation and reminder utilized a unique and anonymous code in the survey link to track response rates by location and ensure that no more than one response was counted per household. FH residents who instead used the general survey link to take the survey were prompted to submit their name, personal email, and neighborhood to verify their eligibility and



limit duplicate responses. All respondents participated in the survey through a secure, web-based platform.

In addition to the open-response comment section, the 2025 TSS questionnaire consisted of 8 Likert-type rating scales containing a total of 30 items about different dimensions of tenant satisfaction, such as community appearance and maintenance services. Table 1 displays the five-point rating scales respondents used to indicate their level of Satisfaction or Agreement, depending on the survey item. Respondents also had the option for each question to select “Don’t Know, No Opinion, or Not Applicable,” in which case the response was not scored.

Table 1. Rating Scale Levels		
Rating Level	Satisfaction Level	Agreement Level
1	Very Dissatisfied	Strongly Disagree
2	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Disagree
3	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4	Somewhat Satisfied	Agree
5	Very Satisfied	Strongly Agree

The survey questionnaire concluded with an open-response comment section for residents to provide their thoughts and recommendations. All of the questions and text used within the questionnaire were developed and approved by the Deputy of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition & Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)), in accordance with the 16 November 2020 Memorandum, *Tenant Satisfaction Survey Policy for DoD Privatized, Owned, or Leased Housing*.

### 3. Scoring Methodology

The TSS results are summarized by Satisfaction Index for three major topics or categories: Property, Service, and Overall. The Property and Service scores both contribute to the Overall score, but there are also questions that only counted towards the Overall score. These Satisfaction Indexes are comprised of nine Business Success Factor (BSF) scores, which are in turn each comprised of one or more question-level scores. The Appendix to this report contains the mapping between the survey questions, BSF categories, and Satisfaction Indexes as approved by CNIC.

The question-level scores represent the average rating (1-5 scale) for all responses, which are multiplied by 20 to re-scale the scores to be out of 100 for ease of interpretation. The scores for each BSF and Satisfaction Index are similarly calculated as the average score over all responses to their component questions. Separate scores are calculated for each level of analysis (CNIC, Region, Installation, and Property/Neighborhood). For example, when calculating the Overall Score for a specific property, we only use the responses from that property. When calculating the topic score for an entire installation, we use the responses for all GOL-FH properties at that installation.



The resulting question, BSF, and Satisfaction Index scores can be broadly categorized into different ranges and interpreted similar to a conventional letter-grading scale. Consistent with the previous (2023) TSS, these ranges are:

Table 2. Score Index Range Interpretation		
Range	Level	Explanation
100 - 85	Outstanding	Exceptional performance and tenant satisfaction
84 - 80	Very Good	Robust performance and tenant satisfaction
79 - 75	Good	Above average levels of satisfaction but with room for improvement
74 - 70	Average	Indicates mixed perceptions and unmet expectations
69 - 65	Below Average	Signifies inadequate performance in need of attention
64 - 60	Poor	Signifies low satisfaction that requires immediate attention
59 - 55	Very Poor	Conveys broad dissatisfaction below acceptable levels
Below 55	Crisis	Signals critical issues that demand urgent resolution

#### 4. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey

Table 3 presents summary results for the 2025 TSS for GOL-FH, including the number of residents, number of responses, response rates, and the Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Index scores by Region, Installation, and for CNIC as a whole. For comparison, Table 3 also includes the results for the previous TSS and the changes between the current and previous TSS, relative to the results of the previous survey. The Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Indexes represent broad categories of tenant satisfaction which can be subdivided into BSF categories. Table 4 supplements Table 3 with a breakdown of the Satisfaction Indexes by BSF, and their changes in score compared with the previous survey. Changes highlighted green or orange mark the largest increase or decrease for each score, respectively, across all installations.

It is important to note that the TSS questionnaire and mapping of questions to BSF and Satisfaction Indexes changed between 2023 and 2025. As a result, some scores may not be directly comparable. Please see the Appendix to this report for a summary of these changes. Besides the changes in the survey questions and scoring methodology, changes in the characteristics of the respondent population between the survey years may also impact the score and their comparability from year-to-year. Locations with few residents and thus few responses can be vulnerable to outliers and response biases. These caveats should be considered while evaluating changes over time.



**Table 3. GOL-FH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey**

Area	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			FY25 Response Rate			FY23	Var
	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.
<b>OVERALL GOL-FH</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>(1.6)</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>(3.2)</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>2,016</b>	<b>34.8%</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
<b>EURAFCENT</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>(2.8)</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>(6.4)</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>	<b>1,442</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
BAHRAIN NSA	99.0	96.0	3.0	97.1	91.4	5.7	100.0	98.9	1.1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
NAPLES NSA	66.2	69.5	(3.3)	65.5	72.2	(6.7)	66.3	67.0	(0.7)	662	263	39.7%	33.1%	6.6%
ROTA NAVSTA	76.1	77.1	(1.0)	74.9	79.0	(4.1)	75.6	75.1	0.5	296	82	27.7%	29.3%	(1.6%)
SIGONELLA NAS	74.9	77.5	(2.6)	73.6	80.0	(6.4)	75.6	75.5	0.1	483	179	37.1%	37.8%	(0.7%)
<b>GUAM</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>68.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1,245</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>12.6%</b>
ANDERSEN GUAM NSA	73.1	67.4	5.7	71.3	65.3	6.0	74.4	69.1	5.3	514	165	32.1%	13.7%	18.4%
GUAM NB	72.7	70.9	1.8	71.1	69.0	2.1	73.1	71.6	1.5	731	251	34.3%	25.5%	8.8%
<b>JAPAN</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>79.1</b>	<b>(0.9)</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>	<b>2,727</b>	<b>896</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>
ATSUGI NAF	76.7	73.6	3.1	75.0	74.2	0.8	78.3	75.1	3.2	364	110	30.2%	24.5%	5.7%
SASEBO CFA	74.7	72.8	1.9	76.0	77.6	(1.6)	76.2	70.9	5.3	484	157	32.4%	18.4%	14.0%
SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	82.5	83.2	(0.7)	78.3	84.7	(6.4)	84.9	82.6	2.3	58	31	53.4%	32.8%	20.6%
YOKOSUKA CFA	79.2	81.0	(1.8)	76.2	79.1	(2.9)	81.9	83.3	(1.4)	1,821	598	32.8%	24.9%	7.9%
<b>KOREA</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>(9.4)</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>(7.9)</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>(10.2)</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>17.7%</b>
CHINHAЕ CFA	80.8	90.2	(9.4)	78.3	86.2	(7.9)	81.9	92.1	(10.2)	44	36	81.8%	64.1%	17.7%
<b>MID-ATLANTIC</b>	<b>94.8</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>91.2</b>	<b>(1.7)</b>	<b>97.2</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>20.3%</b>
WALLOPS IS SCSC	94.8	93.8	1.0	89.5	91.2	(1.7)	97.2	95.2	2.0	12	11	91.7%	71.4%	20.3%
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>(7.2)</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>(4.9)</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>(8.1)</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	69.3	76.4	(7.1)	72.8	77.8	(5.0)	66.4	74.3	(7.9)	330	132	40.0%	33.2%	6.8%



**Table 4. GOL-FH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey**

Satisfaction Index (SI):	Service										Property				Overall Only			
Business Success Factor (BSF):	(1) Readiness to Solve Problems		(2) Responsiveness & Follow-Through		(4) Quality of Management Services		(6) Quality of Maintenance Services		(8) Relationship Rating		(3) Property Appearance & Condition		(7) Property Rating		(5) Quality of Leasing Services		(9) Renewal Intention	
Area	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.
<b>OVERALL GOL-FH</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>(4.9)</b>	<b>73.5</b>	<b>(0.9)</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>(1.1)</b>	<b>79.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>(5.1)</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>(5.2)</b>	<b>73.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>
<b>EURAFCENT</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>(1.0)</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>(4.8)</b>	<b>70.2</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>(8.0)</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>(6.0)</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>
BAHRAIN NSA	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	4.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	16.0	96.0	0.4	NA	NA	100.0	0.0
NAPLES NSA	66.3	(2.5)	58.5	(6.8)	66.9	0.2	64.8	(0.1)	72.0	2.9	68.7	(2.2)	64.4	(8.5)	72.0	(9.3)	65.6	4.7
ROTA NAVSTA	75.6	3.6	69.1	(1.1)	74.3	(0.5)	77.0	(2.9)	78.7	3.6	78.8	(1.3)	73.6	(4.8)	84.1	7.0	79.7	(1.1)
SIGONELLA NAS	77.0	(0.6)	68.9	(3.1)	73.2	(1.6)	77.0	2.7	79.3	1.7	76.3	(2.5)	72.6	(8.1)	75.7	(8.1)	75.0	1.6
<b>GUAM</b>	<b>73.1</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>(1.9)</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>67.1</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>(1.5)</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>5.3</b>
ANDERSEN GUAM NSA	74.2	8.1	66.3	5.3	70.7	7.4	78.5	(1.3)	77.2	9.6	70.7	13.9	71.5	1.3	73.7	(0.2)	71.5	9.3
GUAM NB	72.3	1.3	63.4	(1.5)	72.5	3.1	74.3	(2.9)	77.1	6.1	64.7	6.9	73.3	(2.2)	70.4	(3.9)	77.5	4.9
<b>JAPAN</b>	<b>79.3</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>	<b>74.9</b>	<b>(4.2)</b>	<b>76.6</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>(3.8)</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>(4.3)</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>1.3</b>
ATSUGI NAF	77.5	4.0	73.0	(0.5)	76.0	4.2	82.0	0.7	79.3	7.2	75.7	3.4	74.8	(0.5)	77.9	4.9	72.2	9.7
SASEBO CFA	73.9	5.1	69.9	3.4	69.7	6.8	85.1	3.1	77.5	10.5	76.4	3.6	75.9	(4.4)	64.8	(3.9)	65.4	2.6
SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	85.3	(2.6)	82.9	2.1	77.8	1.5	90.4	4.7	89.0	9.0	80.7	(1.2)	77.6	(8.7)	82.5	0.6	83.3	2.9
YOKOSUKA CFA	80.7	(1.8)	76.1	(6.0)	78.5	(2.3)	86.0	(1.4)	84.0	2.5	76.7	(0.5)	76.0	(4.2)	78.4	(4.6)	74.5	0.1
<b>KOREA</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>(8.0)</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>(15.9)</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>(9.9)</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>(11.7)</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>(7.9)</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>(8.9)</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>(7.4)</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>(8.0)</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>(11.2)</b>
CHINHAEE CFA	86.1	(8.0)	77.1	(15.9)	83.7	(9.9)	78.2	(11.7)	84.2	(7.9)	78.0	(8.9)	78.4	(7.4)	90.0	(8.0)	79.4	(11.2)
<b>MID-ATLANTIC</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>(2.0)</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<b>(1.8)</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<b>4.9</b>
WALLOPS IS SCSC	97.3	0.6	96.4	4.0	98.0	2.0	96.4	2.1	98.1	1.4	86.4	(2.0)	90.6	(2.3)	98.2	(1.8)	98.2	4.9
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>67.4</b>	<b>(6.9)</b>	<b>59.2</b>	<b>(13.5)</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>(9.0)</b>	<b>64.6</b>	<b>(8.1)</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>(4.7)</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>(7.7)</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>(8.1)</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>(5.0)</b>
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	67.4	(6.6)	59.2	(13.3)	66.1	(8.8)	64.6	(7.9)	72.7	(4.5)	74.1	0.3	72.3	(7.7)	74.4	(7.9)	72.3	(5.1)



## 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question

The Satisfaction Indexes and BSF scores can be further broken down into results by question item. Table 5 presents the question items with the five highest and five lowest scores across all GOL-FH locations.

Table 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question	
Question	Score
2a) Safety of your home/unit	85.9
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	85.0
4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	84.8
2b) Security features of your home/unit	79.9
4c) Quality of maintenance work	78.1
7e) Housing is a significant factor in my decision to stay in or leave military service	71.4
5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	70.1
7f) I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed	69.7
3c) Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved	68.8
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	67.8

## 6. Comment Analysis

Survey respondents were prompted to provide comments in an open-response section at the end of the survey. Although tenants provided a wealth of information about their individual living conditions and experiences, general trends can be observed based on the most commonly mentioned topics. RDN identified these trends by classifying tenant comments by type (Negative or Positive), category (8 for Negative and 5 for Positive), and subcategory (62 for Negative and 9 for Positive) as applicable. These categories were pre-established by CNIC.

Table 6 and Table 7 respectively summarize the frequency of Negative and Positive comments by GOL-FH installation and general comment category. Items are color-coded according to their share of total responses (including responses with no comment). In many cases, respondent comments touched on multiple subcategories within the same general category. However, for purposes of this report, each comment may only be counted once for each general category. (Please see the Comment Analysis Excel files for a detailed breakdown of comments by subcategory.)



**Table 6. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation**

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Assignment Process	Home	Maintenance Services	Mgmt Company/ Services	Neighborhood/ Amenities	Rental Rate or Other Fees	Staff	Other
EURAFCENT	BAHRAIN NSA	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	263	3.0%	41.8%	27.8%	13.3%	13.3%	3.0%	10.3%	9.1%
EURAFCENT	ROTA NAVSTA	82	8.5%	37.8%	22.0%	11.0%	9.8%	3.7%	13.4%	7.3%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	179	6.1%	28.5%	14.0%	11.2%	16.2%	2.8%	4.5%	7.8%
GUAM	ANDERSEN GUAM NSA	165	6.1%	24.2%	19.4%	10.3%	10.3%	4.2%	7.3%	12.1%
GUAM	GUAM NB	251	7.6%	31.5%	25.9%	13.1%	20.3%	2.8%	8.4%	7.2%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	110	7.3%	40.9%	10.0%	5.5%	13.6%	5.5%	4.5%	10.0%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	157	22.9%	27.4%	3.2%	14.0%	12.1%	7.6%	5.7%	14.6%
JAPAN	SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	31	6.5%	38.7%	6.5%	3.2%	6.5%	3.2%	-	6.5%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	598	9.4%	28.9%	6.4%	10.5%	14.2%	1.5%	3.7%	6.7%
KOREA	CHINHAЕ CFA	36	8.3%	36.1%	19.4%	5.6%	8.3%	-	8.3%	11.1%
MID-ATLANTIC	WALLOPS IS SCSC	11	-	18.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	132	9.8%	31.1%	26.5%	7.6%	9.8%	0.8%	8.3%	8.3%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,016</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>

Note: Light Red: greater than 10%. Yellow: greater than 20%. Dark Red: greater than 30%.

**Table 7. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation**

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Installation	Home	Staff	Other	Suggestions
EURAFCENT	BAHRAIN NSA	1	-	-	-	-	-
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	263	1.5%	3.0%	4.2%	3.4%	2.7%
EURAFCENT	ROTA NAVSTA	82	1.2%	4.9%	4.9%	8.5%	7.3%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	179	3.9%	5.0%	5.0%	6.7%	4.5%
GUAM	ANDERSEN GUAM NSA	165	1.8%	2.4%	4.2%	2.4%	1.8%
GUAM	GUAM NB	251	2.0%	4.4%	9.6%	6.8%	6.0%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	110	2.7%	2.7%	4.5%	3.6%	5.5%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	157	1.3%	5.1%	3.2%	5.1%	11.5%
JAPAN	SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	31	-	9.7%	6.5%	3.2%	9.7%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	598	2.2%	3.7%	6.2%	4.0%	6.0%
KOREA	CHINHAЕ CFA	36	11.1%	11.1%	13.9%	16.7%	22.2%
MID-ATLANTIC	WALLOPS IS SCSC	11	9.1%	-	9.1%	9.1%	-
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	132	3.0%	2.3%	2.3%	3.8%	1.5%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,016</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>

Green highlight = greater than 10%.

## 7. Discussion

The 2025 GOL-FH TSS results indicate that general resident satisfaction has declined slightly compared to 2023. For CNIC as a whole, the Service Index decreased by 0.6 points and the Property Index decreased by 3.2 points. The Overall Index, which includes both Service and Property Index questions, declined by 1.6 points. Broken down by installation, the largest declines in the Overall Index were at Chinhae CFA (-9.4), Guantanamo Bay NAVSTA (-7.1), and Naples NSA (-3.3). In most cases, the declines in the Overall Index for an installation was led by larger decreases in the Property Index and smaller decreases in the Service Index. Across all installations, the lowest-rated Overall Index was for Naples NSA (66.2).

There were also several installations whose Overall Index score increased compared to last year. The largest increases include Anderson Guam NSA (+5.7), Atsugi NAF (+3.1), and Sasebo CFA (+1.9). Across all installations, the highest-rated Overall Index was for Wallops IS SCSC (94.8).



It is unclear to what extent these comparisons to previous survey scores represent legitimate changes in tenant satisfaction or are an artifact of the changes in the TSS questionnaire and how questions are mapped to the Satisfaction Indexes. Some changes may also be partially attributed to their relatively small sample size for a given location. Areas with higher response rates tend to see results that are more representative of their population than areas with lower response rates. Scores for locations with low response rates, or locations with high response rates but few respondents, may be sensitive to the biases of individuals predisposed toward participation.

It is also important to note that there can be considerable differences in resident counts and scores between properties at the same installation. Ultimately, this means that while it is correct to say that residents from one region, as a whole, are less satisfied with their housing than residents from another region, this statement is not necessarily true for all residents at all installations and properties within those regions. Survey results (both scores and comments) should be reviewed down to the property-level to better understand issues impacting tenants' satisfaction within a Region/Installation.

Having stressed the importance of a nuanced understanding of each location's unique situation, there are still many useful trends and insights to be extracted from the overall data. Certain sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction appear repeatedly across the Navy's GOL-FH portfolio. The following areas of improvement represent the most common issues indicated by the survey scores and comments:

- **Improve Mold Abatement and Education:** A significant number of residents left comments regarding concerns about mold issues in their homes (8.2% of respondents). They feel there is a lack of effective mold management and insufficient information on how to prevent mold growth. Enhancing mold abatement efforts and providing comprehensive education on mold prevention would help alleviate these concerns. This could include regular inspections, prompt remediation, and clear guidelines for residents on maintaining a mold-free environment. Providing educational materials and workshops on mold prevention would empower residents with the knowledge they need to protect their homes.
- **Improvements to Interior Features:** The "Property Rating" BSF and Property Satisfaction Index scores show the most consistently large decline across installations compared to the previous TSS. The question-level scores and survey comments point to residents being unsatisfied in particular with the quality and maintenance of their home's interior fixtures, finishes, and flooring (mentioned in comments submitted by 7.8% of respondents). Funds permitting, capital improvement projects to remodel/upgrade the interiors of older homes in neighborhoods with the lowest property ratings would directly address resident's complaints on this topic.
- **Develop a Dependable System for Management and Maintenance Follow-Up:** While residents generally appreciate the maintenance work and the professionalism of the housing office, many feel inadequately informed about the status and progress of their requests. They also express concerns about the lack of urgency in addressing their issues, as indicated by the high number of comments (7.2% of all respondents) complaining about slow response times. If not already implemented, introducing an automated



ticketing system and enhancing communication regarding outstanding work orders would boost resident satisfaction by keeping them better informed and feeling heard.

These issues are not a comprehensive list of residents’ concerns but rather some of the general insights apparent in the survey results. Every property/neighborhood has its own unique concerns and priorities. Stakeholders are encouraged to review the topic scores, question scores, and comments for the specific Properties pertinent to their area of responsibility.

## 8. Awards

CNIC issues awards to high-performing GOL-FH properties and installations in recognition of their achievements. Individual properties/neighborhoods are eligible to receive an “A List” or “A List Platinum” award if they earned a Service Index score of at least 85.0 or 91.4, respectively. The latter benchmark is based on RDN’s analysis of comparable ratings data for 4,600+ multi-family properties located within an hour commute of US-based Navy installations that participate in the TSS. Properties/Neighborhoods must also achieve at least a 20% response rate. In total, GOL-FH has 10 Platinum A List Award winners and 12 A List Award winners, for a total of 22 Award winners out of 86 properties surveyed (25.6%). Table 8 presents the GOL-FH Property-level Award winners.

**Table 8. GOL-FH Properties: A List Platinum or A List Award Winners**

Region	Installation	Property	Award	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
				Overall	Property	Service	Rec.	Distr.	% Received
EURAFCENT	BAHRAIN NSA	FLAG VILLA	Platinum	99.0	97.1	100.0	1	1	100.0%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	FOQ	Platinum	99.7	99.1	100.0	3	3	100.0%
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	FLAG UNITS	Platinum	100.0	100.0	100.0	1	2	50.0%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	ALASKA,MAIN BASE	Platinum	100.0	100.0	100.0	1	5	20.0%
MID-ATLANTIC	WALLOPS IS SCSC	SKEETER LN	Platinum	94.8	89.5	97.2	11	12	91.7%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	SOQ	Platinum	94.2	89.7	96.9	10	27	37.0%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - IZUMO HEIGHTS	Platinum	87.3	80.3	93.1	16	44	36.4%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	AYAME TOWER,HV	Platinum	91.1	90.3	92.8	5	24	20.8%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	SOQ	Platinum	82.6	72.0	91.5	2	6	33.3%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	NORTH ISLAND,HV	Platinum	89.9	90.3	91.4	4	8	50.0%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - KAMAKURA HEIGHTS	A List	85.7	79.5	90.6	26	64	40.6%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - ISE HEIGHTS	A List	89.0	85.9	90.6	21	68	30.9%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - MIYAJIMA HEIGHTS	A List	87.3	84.3	89.2	22	67	32.8%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	GULFPORT,HV	A List	89.5	92.4	89.2	9	28	32.1%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - YASAKAYATO	A List	85.1	79.4	87.9	13	35	37.1%
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	DEER POINT	A List	85.0	80.0	87.7	1	4	25.0%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	BARA HEIGHTS	A List	83.8	79.7	87.2	17	61	27.9%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	NAS I	A List	84.3	78.5	86.6	5	8	62.5%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - CHOUGAYATO	A List	87.8	90.9	86.5	11	41	26.8%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - YASAKA	A List	78.6	68.9	86.5	7	29	24.1%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	UME HEIGHTS	A List	81.1	76.8	85.7	19	64	29.7%
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	IKEGO - NIKKO HEIGHTS	A List	81.6	79.4	85.1	26	67	38.8%

Blue highlight = Service Score is 85.0 or higher.



Installations may also receive an award for exhibiting general excellence across the installation-level portfolio. Installations receive a “Crystal Award” if (1) the Installation-wide Service Index is 85.0 or higher, (2) the response rate is 20% or higher, and (3) there are at least 2 properties at the Installation. There are no Crystal Award winners for GOL-FH Installations this year.

## 9. Action Plans

Housing management teams at installations who do not meet CNIC’s target performance thresholds for the TSS are required to submit an “Action Plan” to address areas for improvement. Per CNIC guidance, Action Plans must be filled out and submitted to CNIC for all installations that have an Overall, Property, or Service Index of 69.5 or lower. Table 9 presents the 2 installations that meet this requirement.

**Table 9. GOL-FH Installations: Action Plan Required**

Region	Installation	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
		Overall	Property	Service	Rec.	Distr.	% Received
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	66.2	65.5	66.3	263	662	39.7%
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	69.3	72.8	66.4	132	330	40.0%

Orange highlight = Score is 69.5 or lower.

Though not required, local housing offices are also encouraged to complete Action Plans for individual properties or neighborhoods that have any Satisfaction Index below the Action Plan threshold. RDN has produced Action Plan templates for each GOL-FH property and installation to help stakeholders address issues of concern. Housing offices are encouraged to focus on survey questions with the lowest satisfaction scores and develop a plan to address them, including actionable goals, deadlines, and the personnel responsible for implementing them.

## 10. Summary

Tenants of the Navy’s GOL-FH units were surveyed between 3 March 2025 and 1 May 2025. A total of 2,016 responses were received from residents at 86 properties/neighborhoods across 13 installations. These responses provide insight into the thoughts and concerns of the Navy personnel, their families, and civilians who reside in these units. Overall, GOL-FH tenants are slightly less satisfied with their housing in 2025 compared to the previous TSS. The Overall Index for GOL-FH decreased by 1.6 points, from 76.3 in 2023 to 74.7 in 2025. By installation, the 2025 Overall Index score ranges from 66.2 at Naples NSA to 94.8 at Wallops IS SCSC.



## 11. Appendix: Survey Changes and Question Mapping

The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment OUSD(A&S) oversees the annual TSS for the Military Services and is responsible for setting the TSS questions. OUSD(A&S) modified the TSS questions this year with the goal of streamlining the survey and minimizing the time required for respondents to complete it. The overall impact of these changes was to reduce the number of question items from 52 in the previous (2023) survey to 30 in the current (2025) survey, excluding the open-response comment question. While many key question items remain the same between surveys, some of those previously counted in the Business Success Factor (BSF) and Satisfaction Index scores were either combined or eliminated. Other question items were re-coded to a different BSF and Satisfaction Index. The 2025 survey also added two new question items. These changes mean that the scores reported for the 2025 TSS are similar but not necessarily directly comparable to those of previous surveys. Table 10 presents a legend summarizing the SI and BSF abbreviations/codes and the correspondence between them. Table 11 summarizes the changes in the 2025 TSS questions and their coding to the BSF and Satisfaction Index scores as compared to the 2023 TSS.

**Table 10. Legend for 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map**

Table Legend and BSF to SI Correspondence				
Business Success Factor (BSF)		Satisfaction Index (SI)		
No	Description	Property (P)	Service (S)	Overall (O)
1	Readiness to Solve Problems		•	•
2	Responsiveness & Follow-Through		•	•
3	Property Appearance & Condition	•		•
4	Quality of Management Services		•	•
5	Quality of Leasing Services			•
6	Quality of Maintenance Services		•	•
7	Property Rating	•		•
8	Relationship Rating		•	•
9	Renewal Intention			•

**Table 11. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		<b>1. With regard to the appearance and condition of your housing, how satisfied are you with:</b>		<b>1. With regard to the appearance and condition of the housing community, how satisfied are you with:</b>			
P	3	1a)	Overall condition and visual appeal of your housing	1a)	Visual appeal of the community	3	P
				1b)	Overall condition of the community	3	P
P	3	1b)	Condition of the common areas (parking, sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.)	1e)	Condition of roads, parking areas, sidewalks and common areas	3	P
				1c)	Landscaping	3	P
				1d)	Recreation areas	3	P
		<b>2. With regard to safety and security of your home/unit, how satisfied are you with:</b>		<b>4. How satisfied are you with each of the following features of the housing community:</b>			
	NC	2a)	Safety of your home/unit	4a)	Safety	7	P
		2b)	Security features of your home/unit	4b)	Security	7	P
		NA	Not matched	4c)	Parking	7	P
		NA	Not matched	4d)	Visitor Parking	7	P



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS			2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item	Question Item		BSF	SI
<b>3. With regard to the privatized property management office / MHO team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			<b>2. How would you evaluate the property management office team with regard to the following:</b>			
S	1	3a) Ease of contacting when questions or problems arise	2a)	Ease of contacting when questions or problems arise	1	S
S	8	3b) The ability to resolve problems that have been reported	2d)	Ability to do what is required to keep you satisfied	8	S
			2f)	Willingness to respond to your needs	8	S
S	2	3c) Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved	2b)	Follow-up after problems are reported to be sure that they have been resolved	2	S
S	8	3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	2c)	Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	8	S
S	1	3e) Frequency of contact and clarity of communications	2e)	Frequency of contact and communications	1	S
			2g)	Clarity of communication with you	1	S
S	4	3f) Overall level and quality of service you are receiving in housing	2j)	Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	4	S
		NA Not matched	2h)	Willingness to do what they say they will do	2	S
		NA Not matched	2i)	Policies and procedures of the community	4	S
<b>4. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			<b>3. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			
S	6	4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	3c)	Courtesy of maintenance personnel	6	S
S	6	4b) General work order or maintenance request completion time	3a)	Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	6	S
			3b)	Problem resolution	6	S
S	6	4c) Quality of maintenance work	3d)	Quality of maintenance work	6	S
S	6	4d) Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	3e)	Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	6	S
<b>5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home/unit:</b>			<b>5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home:</b>			
P	7	5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	5b)	Landscaping (immediate area around your home/building)	7	P
			5e)	Pest control	7	P
P	7	5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	5f)	Overall interior lighting, bathroom and kitchen cabinets, counters, faucets, and hardware	NC	
			5c)	Appliances provided, if applicable	7	P
P	7	5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	5d)	Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	7	P
P	7	5d) Overall current condition	5a)	Overall condition of your home	7	P



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
<b>6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with:<sup>1</sup></b>				<b>6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the leasing/assignment process?</b>			
O	5	6a)	The assignment and sign-in / signing process	6a)	Ease of the leasing/assignment process	5	O
				6b)	Professionalism with which you were treated by the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6c)	Follow-up and continuing contact with the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6d)	Overall level and quality of the leasing/housing office	5	O
O	5	6b)	The lease renewal process	6a)	Ease of the leasing/assignment process	5	O
				6b)	Professionalism with which you were treated by the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6c)	Follow-up and continuing contact with the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6d)	Overall level and quality of the leasing/housing office	5	O
<b>7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:</b>				<b>7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:</b>			
S	4	7a)	The military housing office (MHO) team adheres to time commitments <sup>2</sup>	7a)	When the property management/housing office team promises to do something by a certain time, they do it	2	S
S	4	7b)	The privatized property management office (if applicable) adheres to time commitments <sup>2</sup>				
O	9	7c)	If extended at this installation, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again	7e)	If extended at this installation, I would want to continue living in this housing community	9	O
O	9	7d)	I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation	7c)	I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation	9	O
	NC	7e)	Housing is a significant factor in my decision to stay in or leave military service	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	NA	
S	4	7f)	I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed	NA	<i>Not matched</i>		
		NA	<i>Not matched</i>	7b)	Overall Resident morale at this housing community is good	8	S
		NA	<i>Not matched</i>	7d)	The property management team is doing all they can to make this housing community appealing to Residents	8	S
		NA	<i>Not matched</i>	7f)	Given the choice in the future, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again	9	O



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		<b>8. Considering all factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:</b>		<b>8. Considering all Factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:</b>			
P	7	8a)	Your current home/unit	8a)	Your home	NC	
P	7	8b)	The health and safety of your home	8c)	The health and safety of your home	NC	
S	4	8c)	Your housing office as your advocate <sup>1,2</sup>	8f)	The government housing office as your advocate	NC	
	NC	8d)	Engagement of the leadership within your Chain of Command on housing issues	8g)	Your Chain of Command in engaging on housing issues	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8b)	Your current housing community	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8d)	The health and safety of your current housing community (parks, roads, lighting, etc.)	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8e)	The property management/housing office response to and correction of your health and safety concerns	NC	
				<b>9. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following:</b>			
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	9a)	I would recommend this housing community to others	NC	

<sup>1</sup>For these questions, respondents were additionally instructed: "If you live in government-owned / controlled housing, please rate the MHO; if you live in privatized housing, please rate the privatized Property Management office."

<sup>2</sup>Questions 7a) and 8c) are included in the Service/Overall Topic Scores for GOL housing only. Similarly, question 7b) is included in the Service/Overall Topic Scores for PPV housing only.

Note: Changes in BSF coding for similar questions are highlighted in red.

